

**Remarks**

Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. Claims 2 and 3 are being amended. Applicants submit no new matter is being introduced by way of this Reply. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Phillips et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,454,206) hereinafter “Phillips.”

Applicants believe a brief overview of an example embodiment would be helpful. In an example embodiment, an apparatus configured to select one of a plurality of identities based at least in part upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application. Applicants believe none of the cited references disclose the feature of selecting one of a plurality of identities based upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application as recited in Claim 1 (“...the processor is configured to automatically select one of a plurality of identities selectable for use by the respective application the respective identity being selected based upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application...”).

As indicated in the Office Action on page 10, Phillips teaches, “the wireless communication device 14 may [select] use different user identifiers to identify the user in different communication sessions without the user’s knowledge, col. 6, lines 44-46, i.e., wherein a preferred user identifier is used for the communication session which of a particular application 62 is being invoked, col. 7, lines 30-32.” Phillips appears to use a user identifier. An identifier is used to identify a user and is not a user preference. Moreover, the Office Action on page 8 indicates Phillips is selecting “based on the requested session type.” Accordingly, even if Phillips uses a user identifier, Phillips is not basing the search of the identifier. Further still, Applicants claimed feature is basing a portion of the search on a preference and not a user identity. Accordingly, Phillips does not base the selection at least in part on at least one user preference independent of user input to the application as claimed in Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claims 10-12 and 14-16 depend from Claim 9 and Claims 18-20 and 22-24 depend from Claim 18, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 5, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips in view of Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,593) hereinafter “Gabber.”

Gabber discloses an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not provide selecting one of a plurality of identities selectable for use by the respective application the respective identity being selected based upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application. Instead, Gabber merely provides a central proxy system, e.g., a wired terminal, with computer-executable routines. The central proxy system processes site-specific substitute identifiers constructed from data specific to users. The central proxy system transmits the substitute identifiers to the server sites, which re-transmits browsing commands received from the users to the server sites (Gabber, Abstract). In this way, Gabber provides an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not teach selecting one of a plurality of identities selectable for use by the respective application the respective identity being selected based upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application as claimed in Claim 1.

Thus, Gabber does not add the missing claimed feature of “the processor is configured to automatically select one of a plurality of identities selectable for use by the respective application the respective identity being selected based upon the application and at least one user preference independent of user input to the application” to Phillips as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 so it too should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claim 13 depends from Claim 9 and Claim 21 depends from Claim 17, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

**Conclusion**

It is clear from the foregoing that the claims are in condition for allowance. An early formal notice of allowance of claims is respectfully requested. Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment that may be due in this matter to Deposit Account Number 50-0270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas J. Arria/

Thomas J. Arria  
Registration No. 60,223

Date: September 27, 2010

NOKIA, INC.  
Intellectual Property Rights  
ATTN: Docketing  
6021 Connection Drive, MS 2-5-520  
Irving, Texas 75039

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.

/Denise M. Wilson/  
Signed

September 27, 2010  
Date